

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

RELAY IP, INC.

Plaintiff,

v.

CABLEVISION SYSTEMS CORPORATION,

Defendant.

C.A. No. \_\_\_\_\_

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

**COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT**

Plaintiff Relay IP, Inc. ("Relay IP") alleges the following for its complaint against Defendant Cablevision Systems Corporation.

**THE PARTIES**

1. Plaintiff Relay IP, Inc. is a corporation formed under the laws of the state of Delaware having its principal place of business at 2331 Mill Road, Suite 100, Alexandria, VA 22314.

2. Defendant Cablevision Systems Corporation is a corporation organized under the laws of the state of Delaware with a principal office at 1111 Stewart Avenue, Bethpage, NY 11714. Defendant Cablevision Systems Corporation may be served with process via its registered agent, Corporation Service Company, 2711 Centerville Road, Suite 400, Wilmington, DE 19808.

**JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

3. This is a patent infringement action. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§1331 and 1338.

4. The Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant, as it is incorporated in this State.

5. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§1391(b)-(c) and §1400(b), because Defendant resides in this District.

**COUNT ONE**  
**INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 5,331,637**

6. On July 19, 1994, U.S. Patent No. 5,331,637 (the “’637 Patent”) entitled “Multicast Routing Using Core Based Trees” was duly and legally issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office. A true and correct copy of the ’637 Patent is attached as Exhibit A hereto.

7. Plaintiff is the sole and exclusive owner of all right, title, and interest in the ’637 Patent and holds the exclusive right to take all actions, including the filing of this patent infringement lawsuit, necessary to enforce its rights to the ’637 Patent. Plaintiff also has the right to recover all damages for past, present, and future infringement of the ’637 Patent and to seek injunctive relief as appropriate under the law.

8. Defendant has infringed and continues to directly infringe one or more claims of the ’637 Patent, including at least Claim 1, by using the method claimed in providing its television and internet services, which practice multicast routing methods, including but not limited to Protocol Independent Multicast-Sparse Mode standard (“PIM-SM”).<sup>1</sup> Upon information and belief, at least Defendant’s Optimum service practices at least Claim 1 by providing multicast routing services in accordance with the PIM-SM standard. Defendant’s acts of practicing such methods, including the PIM-SM standard, constitute infringement under 35 U.S.C. §271 for which it is directly liable.

---

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g., RFC 4601 at <http://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc4601>.

9. As a result of Defendant's infringement, Plaintiff Relay IP has been damaged monetarily and is entitled to adequate compensation of no less than a reasonable royalty pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284.

**JURY DEMAND**

Plaintiff requests a jury on all issues so triable.

**PRAYER**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court:

- A. Enter judgment that Defendant has directly infringed, either literally or by equivalents, the '637 Patent;
- B. Award Plaintiff damages for Defendant's infringement in an amount to be determined at trial, including enhanced damages, costs, and pre and post-judgment interest; and
- C. Award any other relief deemed just and proper.

July 29, 2013

BAYARD, P.A.

OF COUNSEL:

Paul V. Storm  
Sarah M. Paxson  
GARDERE WYNNE SEWELL LLP  
1601 Elm Street, Suite 3000  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
(214) 999-3000  
pvstorm@gardere.com  
spaxson@gardere.com

/s/ Stephen B. Brauerman (sb4952)  
Richard D. Kirk (rk0922)  
Stephen B. Brauerman (sb4952)  
Vanessa R. Tiradentes (vt5398)  
222 Delaware Avenue, Suite 900  
Wilmington, DE 19801  
(302) 655-5000  
rkirk@bayardlaw.com  
sbrauerman@bayardlaw.com  
vtiradentes@bayardlaw.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiff Relay IP, Inc.*